

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
CLARKSBURG DIVISION

COOKE & MOSES, LLC,  
ROY COOKE AND JEFFREY MOSES

Plaintiffs,

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:06-CV-147  
(Judge Keeley)

v.

QSS-ENGINEERED SYSTEMS GROUP, LLC,  
d/b/a Deligo Technologies, a Michigan  
Limited Liability Company,  
QUALITY SOFTWARE SOLUTIONS, INC.,  
a Michigan Corporation, d/b/a  
QSSOLUTIONS, INC., THOMAS KELLY,  
DAVID H. MARSH, ARTHUR C. CARLUCCI,  
DENNIS MOORE, DEMO A. STAVROS,  
ROBERT WIDMAN, ROBERT ZEINSTRA,  
and JOHN DOES 1-10

Defendants.

ORDER FOLLOWING JULY 12, 2007 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDED COMPLAINT

On July 12, 2007, the Court granted the plaintiffs' motion to amend their amended complaint. (Doc. No. 34.) Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** the plaintiffs to file their Second Amended Complaint within seven (7) business days of the entry of this Order. Further, the Court **ORDERS** the defendants to file a reply brief to the pending motion to dismiss (doc. no. 12) no later than seven (7) business days following the filing of the plaintiffs' Second

ORDER FOLLOWING JULY 12, 2007 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDED COMPLAINT

---

Amended Complaint.<sup>1</sup> To the extent that the defendants wish to raise additional arguments in their reply brief that they deem necessary to address amended allegations in the plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint, they may do so.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, the Court will hear oral argument on the defendants' pending motion to dismiss on **August 15, 2007 at 10:00 a.m.** at the **Clarksburg, West Virginia point of holding Court.**

It is **SO ORDERED.**

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to counsel of record.

DATED: July 20, 2007

/s/ Irene M. Keeley  
IRENE M. KEELEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order supercedes any prior Order of the Court regarding the defendants' deadline to file their reply to their motion to dismiss.

<sup>2</sup> On July, 20, 2007, the defendants filed a motion for clarification of the Court's Order granting the plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend. (Doc. No. 35.) Given the rulings outlined above, the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** the defendant's motion for clarification.